

district court of the united states  
district of medford

FILED 12 DEC 14 10 56 USDC-DM

People of the united States of America,  
Delant-Cory; family of palmerton,  
Private Attorney General  
2420 Demaray Dr  
Grants Pass, OR. [97527]

CASE # 1:12-cv-02254PA

**Declarant**

Vs

Administrative Law Judge

Eric Holder, an individual U.S.  
Department of Justice 950  
Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Hillary Rodham Clinton, an individual  
U.S. Department of  
State 2201 C Street NW  
Washington, DC 20520

UNITED STATES as an Involuntary Plaintiff,

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, Seat of Government

**RESPONDENTS**

**WRIT FOR DECLARATORY CHALLENGE;  
REQUEST FOR DECLARATORY  
JUDGMENT PER FED. R. CIV. P., RULE 57,  
IMPROPER USE OF LAWS; JUST CAUSE  
FOR "IN FORMA PAUPERIS"**

### **RULE 57, DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS**

The procedure for obtaining a declaratory judgment pursuant to Sections 2721.01 to 2721.15, inclusive, of the Revised Code, shall be in accordance with these rules. The existence of another adequate remedy does not preclude a judgment for declaratory relief in cases where it is appropriate. The court may advance on the trial list the hearing of an action for a declaratory judgment.

[Effective: July 1, 1970.]

The “controversy” must necessarily be “of a justiciable nature, thus excluding an advisory decree upon a hypothetical state of facts.” (paraphrased from P. 325 of the Certiorari) *Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority*, 297 U.S. 288, 325, 56 S.Ct. 466, 473, 80 L.Ed. 688, 699 (1936). “The existence or nonexistence of any right, duty, power, liability, privilege, disability, or immunity or of any fact upon which such legal relations depend, or of a status, may be declared. The petitioner must have a practical interest in the declaration sought and all parties having an interest therein or adversely affected must be made parties or be cited. A declaration may not be rendered if a special statutory proceeding has been provided for the adjudication of some special type of case, but general ordinary or extraordinary legal remedies, whether regulated by statute or not, are not deemed special statutory proceedings.”

### **REASONS FOR JUST CAUSE FOR *in forma pauperis***

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 4, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

1. This Declarant, Delant- Cory; family of palmerton, points to the Constitution for the united States of America, Article 1, section 10, clause 1, **Section 10**. No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; **make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts;**

pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

2. This Declarant also points to P.L. 1, 48 stat C 1.

3. This Declarant also points to the Federal Reserves Act of 1913 section 16 This tell you about the Federal Reserve Notes; Federal reserve notes, to be issued at the discretion of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the purpose of making advances to Federal reserve banks through the Federal reserve agents as hereinafter set forth and for no other purpose, are authorized. The said notes shall be obligations of the United States and shall be receivable by all national and member banks and Federal reserve banks and for all taxes, customs, and other public dues. They shall be redeemed in lawful money on demand at the Treasury Department of the United States, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, or at any Federal Reserve bank.

4. This Declarant also points to P.L. 40, 40 stat L 411, section 5, subdivision (b) of October 6, 1917 (Trading with the Enemy Act) as it is written in P.L. 1, 48 stat C 1.

#### **I. INTRODUCTION AND OPENING STATEMENT**

NOW COMES, The Declarant, Delant- Cory; family of palmerton (hereafter Declarant), as a Private Attorney General and as one of the People of the united States of America, and on behalf of the People of the united States of America in the two hundredth and twenty fifth year of the Republic, and by congressional mandate of the Civil Rights Act of 1866, 14 Stat 27, enacted April 9, 1866, (and sometimes referred to as The Private Attorney General Act) 39th Congress, Sess. 1, Ch 31 (1866), CHAP. XXXL, (Formally titled): An Act to protect all Person in the United States in their Civil Rights, and furnish the Means

of their Vindication, April 9, 1866; Public Law 104-317, Oct 19, 1996, 110 Stat 3853; 93 stat 1284; and Public Law 96-170, 96th Congress, Dec 29th 1979, and places before this district court of the United States a Writ for a Declaratory Challenge; Request For Declaratory Judgment Per Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 57, improper use of laws; Just Cause For "in forma pauperis".

**(Frankenhauser v. Rizzo, 59 F.R.D. (1973).**

"It is the manner of enforcement which gives Title 42 1983 its unique importance, for *enforcement is placed in the hands of the people*. Each citizen acts as a private attorney general who 'takes on the mantel of the sovereign,'" guarding for all of us the individual liberties enunciated in the Constitution."

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 5 through 9, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

5. This Declarant, one of the People of the united States of America, and on behalf of the People of the united States of America, and acting by Congressional mandate as a Private Attorney General, bring before this district court of the United States in Washington, D.C., Questions of Law of National interest as these "Laws" affect each and everyone who lives in the united States of America and also affects the People's daily lives. These laws have affects on the People of the united States of America, and this Declarant, on the right to travel, federal funding and grants programs to all of the several States, the Highway Safety Act program, Social Security, Bank mortgages, Bankruptcy, Agriculture, etc., and procedures in every Courtroom on taxation without representation, civil and criminal actions in State courts as well as Federal courts, to name just a few issues.

6. As there are Court cases pending across this Nation and other Court cases about to start, Federally as well in the State's Courts, all on the usage of the UNITED STATES

CODES as "LAW" and the contents that appear in Title 1 through Title 50 of these Codes, this Declarant comes before this district court of the United States to address what is in the National interest in which these LAWS affect the People of the united States of America, and this Declarant's, lives on a Daily base. Whereas the People of this Nation lives are affected the need for a Declaratory Judgment in "LAW" on the "LAWS" is needed to clarify the "rights" of the People as Constitutional violations under the Bill of Rights are being committed, and statutory violations to defraud the federal government are occurring, and as this trend has become a growing concern to the People, and to this Declarant acting as a Private Attorney General.

7. Whereas our Forefathers did create the Constitution to give the People elective powers, to elect people to hold public office under the authority granted under Article I of the Constitution to create laws and to define the intent of these law in the form of Public Laws as enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives, however, the intent of the "LAWS" are being negated by H.R. 10000 which, purportedly, was the mere passage of the "authorization" for "**publication**" of these consolidated and codified laws and NOT the re-enactment of these "laws" in their "new form." This district court of the United States is aware that any House Bill (H.R.), in itself, is just a proposed law and not a law unless it is approved by those elected and enacted into Public Law by those elected under Article I of the Federal Constitution.

8. Whereas those elected under Article I of the Federal Constitution had power to create "LAWS," the Forefathers did also incorporate into Article I the authority to create Article III "inferior courts" to address Judicial Power and to extend it to all cases in law under this Constitution and the laws of the United States as found in Article III, section 2,

clause 1. Therefore, this district court of the United States has subject matter and personal jurisdiction over this controversy as a matter in Law and under the Federal Constitution.

9. This Declarant set before this district court of the United States authorization for jurisdiction under the Federal government's own Rules under Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 57, Declaratory Judgment, and below in section II for jurisdiction as well as the venue under section III (of this filing) as found in the Federal Constitution and the Revised Statutes of 1873.

## **II. JURISDICTION OF THE "district court of the United States"**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 20, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

10. 1787 Constitution, Article III, section 1, and section 2, clause 1

11. The Revised Statutes of 1873

12 Judicial Act of 1789 as founded in Vol I of the Public Statutes at Large  
ORGANIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT IN 1789, TO MARCH 3, 1845.

13. 28 United States Code, §1331 FEDERAL QUESTION

14. 28 United States Code, §1332 DIVERSITY OF CITIZENSHIP; AMOUNT IN  
CONTROVERSY; COSTS

15. 28 United States Code, §1343 CIVIL RIGHTS AND ELECTIVE FRANCHISE

16. 28 United States Code, §1357 INJURIES UNDER FEDERAL LAWS

17. 28 United States Code, §1366 CONSTRUCTION OF REFERENCES TO LAWS  
OF THE UNITED STATES OR ACTS OF CONGRESS

18. 28 United States Code, §610 COURTS DEFINED

19. 18 United States Code, §3231. district court

20. Statutes At Large, Vol. 44, part 1, "The Code Of The Laws of the United States of America of a General and Permanent Character in Force December 7, 1925 and Appendix with Laws to December 6, 1926 – Consolidated, Codified, Set Forth, and Published in 1926, in the One Hundred and Fiftieth (150) Year of the Republic, At its First Session, by the Sixty-Ninth Congress."

—

### **III. VENUE OF THE "district court of the United States"**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 26, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

21. 28 United States Code, § 1390 SCOPE

22. 28 United States Code, § 1391 VENUE GENERALLY

23. 4 United States Code, § 72 PUBLIC OFFICES; AT SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

24. 16 Stat 419 and the Act of 1871.

25. The Reconstruction Act of 1867 (March 2, 1867, 14 Stat. 428-430, c. 153; March 23, 1867, 15 Stat. 2-5, c. 6, July 19, 1867, 15 Stat. 14-16, c. 30; and March 11, 1868, 15 Stat. 41, c. 25)

26. The District of Columbia, United States Constitution, 14th Amendment sections 2, 3 and 4.

### **IV. FED. R. CIV. P., RULE 57, DECLARATORY JUDGMENT**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 31, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

27. Statutory remedy for the determination of a Justiciable controversy where the plaintiff is in doubt as to his or her legal rights.



28. A binding adjudication of the rights and status of litigants even though no consequential relief is awarded.

29. Individuals may seek a declaratory judgment after a legal controversy has arisen but before any damages have occurred or any laws have been violated.

30. A declaratory judgment differs from other judicial rulings in that it does not require that any action be taken. Instead, the judge, after analyzing the controversy, simply issues an opinion declaring the rights of each of the parties involved.

31. A declaratory judgment may only be granted in justiciable controversies—that is, in actual, rather than hypothetical, controversies that fall within a court's jurisdiction.

#### **V. JUST CAUSE FOR FILING *IN FORMA PAUPERIS***

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 32, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

32. This Declarant points to the Constitution for the united States of America. Article 1, section 10, clause 1 - No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; **make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts**; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility. In view of the fact that gold and silver coin (or money (currency) based on either) is no longer available for this Declarant, Delant-Cory; family of palmerton, to use to pay the filing fee for this action, files this declaratory challenge *in forma pauperis*. The Declarant will remind this Court that the value of the Federal Reserve Note (which the People are compelled to use through Public Policy) has not so much as a penny's worth of gold or silver backing it and lacks equal value of that of a 1 troy ounce of 99.99 percent



pure gold or as a 1 troy ounce of .9995 percent fine gold for equal exchange dollar for dollar. (See USC Title 31, Chapter 51.)

SEE Cases that Validates the 1933 bankruptcy is:

First National Bank of Montgomery vs Jerome Daly, Jan 23, 1969.  
Credit River decision.

MEMPHIS BANK & TRUST CO. v. GARNER, 459 U.S. 392 (1983)  
459 U.S. 392.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA vs. KATHY RAY WAHLER, EDWARD,  
WILLIAM WAHLER, and LEWIS, VINCENT HUGHES, November 7, 2009,  
DOCKET NO. 1:08-CR-55, Case 1:08-cr-00055-RLV-DCK

## **VI. PARTIES TO ACTION**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 38, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

33. The People of the united States of America are real parties to this action at all times relevant herein as those parties live on the States as National Citizens with a Certification of Live Birth to these States.

34. Declarant, Delant-Cory; family of palmerton, is a real party to this action at all times relevant herein as this party lives on the State of Oregon as a National Citizens with a Certification of Live Birth.

35. Respondent, Eric Holder, is an individual to this action and at all times relevant herein as this party has volunteered under Title 8 United States Code, section 1481 to give up his National citizenship to his home State and comes under the jurisdiction of the

District of Columbia as a 14th Amendment citizen under sections 2, 3 and 4.

36. Respondent, Hillary Rodham Clinton, is an individual to this action and at all times relevant herein as this party has volunteered under Title 8 United States Code, section 1481 to give up her National citizenship to her home State and comes under the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia as a 14th Amendment citizen under sections 2, 3 and 4.

37. The UNITED STATES as an involuntary plaintiff in this action and at all times relevant as the Respondent invoked the usage of the Title "UNITED STATES" when it references UNITED STATES CODES in any of the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS upon a conviction of one of the People of the United States of America.

38. The DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, Seat of Government, as an involuntary plaintiff in this action and at all times relevant as it comes under the United States Constitution, under Article 1, section 8, clause 17 (not to exceed a ten mile square area) and by an Act of Congress, 16 stat 419, and the Act of 1871, and as all Congressional Acts are created within this jurisdiction of the 10 mile square area.

## **VII. STATUTES AT LARGE, VOL. 44, PART 2**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 41, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

39. The Statutes At Large, Vol 44, part 2, ch 712, pages 777 and 778 on June 30, 1926 refers to HR 10000 which refers to an Act To consolidate, codify, and set forth the general

and permanent laws of the United States in force December seventh, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five .

40. HR 10000 is printed in a separate volume entitled "The Code of the Laws of the United States of America, etc..." as Part 1 of Volume 44 of the Statutes at Large as previously titled in paragraph 10.

41. CHAP. 713. -An Act To provide for the **publication** of the Act to consolidate, codify, and set forth the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December 7, 1925, with index, reference tables, appendix, and so forth.

### **VIII. A FEDERAL QUESTION OF AUTHORITY**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 45, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

42. A Federal question before this district court of the United States comes under 28 USC, 1331 Federal Question; The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. Do these district courts of the United States have original jurisdiction as written in 28 USC, sec. 1331 ? And,

43. 28 USC § 1343 - CIVIL RIGHTS AND ELECTIVE FRANCHISE

(b) For purposes of this section—

(1) The District of Columbia shall be considered to be a State; and

(2) Any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia.

And,

44. Title 18 U.S.C. § 3231: District courts. The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, exclusive of the courts of the States, of all offenses against the laws of the United States. Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof. And,

45. See the Federal United States Constitution, Article III, section 2, clause 1.

### **IX. THE FEDERAL ISSUES INTRODUCED**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraph 45, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

46. The People of the united States of America and this Declarant, Delant-Cory; family of palmerton, bring Federal Issues and Questions before this district court of the United States for a declaratory judgment and declaratory relief.

### **X. 1ST FEDERAL ISSUE**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 52, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

47. The first issue before the district court of the United States is that if the Statutes at Large Vol 44, part 2 clearly "states" that on December 7, 1925 that The Code of the Laws of the United States of America was passed by Congress on this date (December 7, 1925) as the Statutes at Large. Is the passage by Congress the Authority by which all laws become written public laws ?

48. Another question arises. Why in Vol. 43 of the Statutes at Large, Part 1 on the last page of this Vol. does it stop at March 4th 1925, and then in Vol 44, Part 2, why does it pick up with a **re-starting date** of December 16, 1925 ?

49. If the Code of the Laws of the United States of America was passed on December 7, 1925 then why was there no Congressional record showing this date (December 7, 1925) in the Statutes at Large validating that these laws had been passed and **enacted** into public law on that date ?

50. The only thing that the Statutes at Large "states" on December 7, 1925 is An Act To provide for the "**publication**" of the Act to consolidate, codify, and set forth the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December 7, 1925, with index, reference tables, appendix, and so forth.

51. The **Publication** of The Code of the Laws of the United States of America does not make them Federal "laws" without an "enacting clause" or a "re-enacting clause" that the Statutes at Large should have indicated.

52. The Statutes at Large clearly shows in Vol. 43, Part 1, and Vol. 44, Part 1 and Part 2, that no such Congressional passage, enactment or authority had been indicated on "December 7, 1925." As there is no Congressional enactment clause found in the Statutes at Large for Title 1 through Title 50 for the UNITED STATES CODES, then by what authority does Eric Holder, or any other Federal prosecutor, have to use these codes to deprive any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution against the Citizens of the united States of America ?

### **XI. 2ND FEDERAL ISSUE**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 53, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

53. The People of the united States of America and this Declarant come before this district court of the United States for a declaratory judgment to address public laws. Are Public Laws "the laws" of the United States and for the People of the united States of America or just for the Federal government and those who come under the 14th Amendment, section 2 through 4, and Title 5 GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION AND EMPLOYEES ?

### **XII. 3RD FEDERAL ISSUE**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 55, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

54. The People of the united States and this Declarant bring forth the Public Law Civil Rights Act of 1866, 14 Stat 27, enacted April 9, 1866, (and sometimes referred to as The Private Attorney General Act) 39th Congress, Sess. 1, Ch 31 (1866), CHAP. XXXL, An



Act to protect all Person in the United States in their Civil Rights, and furnish the Means of their Vindication, April 9, 1866.

55. A 3rd issue for declaratory judgment before this district court of the United States is, are the People of the united States of America or this Declarant under this Public Law (the Civil Rights Act of 1866) and required to have either a law degree and/or hold a BAR Card to practice law in Federal or state courts when the Civil Rights Act of 1866 doesn't state any conditions for the position of Private Attorney General?

### **XIII. CAUSE FOR THIS ACTION**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 60, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

56. Whereas the Publication of the UNITED STATES CODES, Title 1 thru Title 50, has been in use as far back as 1926 does this not constitute justification to deprive the People of this nation of their Rights under the Bill of Rights when Congress has failed to observe the enactment clause of these public laws to be recorded in the Statutes at Large.

57. Does mere "Publication" of a law make it Law without an enacting or re-enacting clause or approval by Congress?

58. Whereas the Public Laws are the first stage of a law to become law, it appears to be the intent/method by which all laws of the United States are created. Is this not true ?

59. Whereas Congress created Public Law ostensibly for the People of the united States of America to enforce law in the courts, then would holding a BAR Card not be a requirement for the People by these Public Laws? (See Civil Rights Act of 1866, 14 Stat 27, Public Law 104-317, Oct 19, 1996, 110 Stat 3853; 93 stat 1284; and Public Law 96-170, 96th Congress, Dec 29, 1979).

60. Whereas laws are violated by those who fail to uphold Federal laws, State Codes or Statutes or Constitutionally protected Rights such as the Bill of Rights, as it is recorded as part of the Constitution, Congress did give the People a Means of Vindication to sue under civil and criminal jurisdiction for a cause of action.

#### **XIV. DIVERSITY OF CITIZENSHIP**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 65, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

61. WHEREAS the District of Columbia is defined as a Federal District AND a Federal Territory in the Congressional enactment of 16 stat 419 (the Act of 1871), this places Eric Holder and the Declarant under diversity as this Declarant holds National Citizenship of one of the separate States. Does he not ?

62. Eric Holder holds citizenship under the District of Columbia's United States Constitution under the 14th Amendment, sections 2, 3 and 4 as a Federal citizen of a Federal District or Federal Territory.

62. Hillary Rodham Clinton holds citizenship under the District of Columbia's United States Constitution under the 14th Amendment, sections 2, 3 and 4 as a Federal citizen of a Federal District or Federal territory.

64. The "United States" is clearly and definitively defined by the Boundary Stones. One side of the various (originally 40 in total) boundary markers that faced the Federal Territory (the future Washington, D.C.) was inscribed "Jurisdiction of the United States." The opposite side of each boundary stone was marked with the name of the bordering state: either Virginia or Maryland.

65. District of Columbia; The survey team created a “visto,” or clearing, that encompassed a square of 100 square miles (259 km<sup>2</sup>) of federal territory that became the District of Columbia in 1801. Each side of the square was 10 miles (16 km) long. The axes (plural of axis) between the corners of the square ran north-south and east-west. The north-south axis is now located between 17th and 18th Streets, NW; the east-west axis is between Constitution Avenue and C Street, NE and NW, and in 1871 became the official seat of the Federal government which encompasses the legislative, executive and the judicial branches of the Federal government.

#### **XV. CIVIL RIGHTS AND ELECTIVE FRANCHISE**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 72, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

66. The purpose of “civil rights”: To redress the deprivation, under color of any State law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, of any right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution of the United States or by any Act of Congress providing for equal rights of citizens or of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

67. This Declarant, along with the People of the united states of America in the two hundred and twenty fifth year of the Republic, has been deprived of Due Process in lawful courts of law in violation of the Respondents and their agents under the usage of the Title of UNITED STATES in Federal Courts named as **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT(S)**.

68. The Respondents have used the UNITED STATES CODES to convict, imprison, and injure the People of this nation.

69. The Respondents, being educated in the laws and congressional acts, did knowingly and did willfully operate under “color of law” to deprive the America People of Due Process in a court of law.

70. The Respondents, under the assumption and presumption of color of law, have knowingly and willfully forced the American People to employ members of the Corporation to represent People in the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT. (Corporation means Federal Bar Association per Title 36 USC, chapter 705, and the Corporation of Washington, D.C., et al., per the Act of 1871.)

71. The Respondents and their agents and members of the Corporation knowingly and willfully have refused to uphold the Constitution and knowingly and willfully misrepresented the United States Codes and the Federal court system.

72. These violations by the Respondents and their agents and members of the Corporation knowingly and willingly do and did violate the Civil Rights of the American People who come under the Bill of Rights and the Civil Rights Act of 1866 (see paragraph 43 of this filing).

#### **XVI. INJURIES UNDER FEDERAL LAWS**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 77, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

73. The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action commenced by any person to recover damages for any injury to his person or property because of any act done to him, under any Act of Congress, for the protection or collection of any of the revenues, or to enforce the rights of citizens of the united States to vote in any State. Is this not true?

74. This Declarant, in the name of the People of the united States of America and on his own behalf as an injured party under Federal laws, has come before this district court of the United States to address the non-enforcement of Federal laws.

75. This Declarant is also expressing and exposing potential fraud perpetrated upon the People of the united States of America and on himself and that Congress or the Senate did legally pass the Codification of the United States Codes on December 7, 1925.

76. The only thing that shows in Volume 44, part 2, page 777 of Chap 712 is written below, HOWEVER it failed to either approve OR ENACT it.

CHAP. 712. -An Act To consolidate, codify, and set forth the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December seventh, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five.

[This Act is printed in a separate volume entitled "The Code of the Laws of the United States of America," as Part I of Volume 44 of the Statutes at Large.]

and,

77. The only thing that shows in Volume 44, part 2, page 778 in chap 713 is the "approval of the Publication" of the Codes.

CHAP. 713.-An Act To provide for the **publication** of the Act to consolidate, codify, and set forth the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December 7, 1925, with index, reference tables, appendix, and so forth .  
(Approved, June 30, 1926)

## **XVII. CONSTRUCTION OF REFERENCES TO LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES OR ACTS OF CONGRESS**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 81, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

78. For the purposes of this chapter (Title 28, sec. 1366), references to laws of the United States or Acts of Congress do not include laws applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia.

79. This requirement for Acts of Congress is **within** the District of Columbia and what is known as the United States within the 10 mile square area defined in the Constitution, and other Acts, of the Federal district and Federal territory.

80. Misapplication of the Statutes at Large and the United States Codes falls under the jurisdiction of the district court of the United States and the 10 mile square area.

80. As it is the responsibility of Eric Holder, being the Attorney General for the United States, it is his responsibility to ensure that the laws being used are valid and legitimate for the usage for his office and his agents.

#### **XVIII. COURTS DEFINED**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 83, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

82. Both 28 United States Code §610 COURTS DEFINED and 18 United States Code §3231. DISTRICT COURTS define this district court of the United States as the proper and correct spelling of the court's name for the purposes of this filing.

83. The Revised Statutes of 1873 clearly shows that the district court of the United States is the proper venue, jurisdiction, spelling and styling as the term “UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT” fails to appear in either the Revised Statutes of 1873 or in the Constitution of 1787.



### **XIX. STATEMENT OF THE 1ST ISSUE**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 93, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

84. The 1st Issue that this Declarant states for the People of the united States of America, and on his own behalf, and brings forth, is a request for a declaratory judgment on the issue of the United States Code having never been passed with an enabling clause on December 7, 1925 in the Statutes at Large.

85. This failure to comply with legislative rules and procedures has injured and has harmed millions of American Citizens by the misapplication and the misuse of these United States Codes.

86. The mere fact that Congress tried to codify and pass all 50 titles under one bill violates the Constitution (and the Jefferson's Manual) of one subject, one title, one issue as purported under H.R.10000.

87. The fact that Volume 44, part 2, chapter 712 addresses the consolidation and codification of the Codes to be placed in a separate volume of part 1 of Volume 44 and was never approved by Congress.

88. The fact that Volume 44, part 2, chapter 713 addresses merely the **publication** of the Codes was approved on June 30, 1926 but was written in part I of Vol. 44 and was not approved.

89. A further issue arises that December 7, 1925, which was the date for H.R 10000, never appeared in the Statutes at Large as a valid date.

And,

90. Further, there is no Public Law to support

H.R.10000 is to be found in the Statutes at Large.

And,

91. And, further, no approval date or enactment had happened when part 1 of Vol. 44 was written.

92. The Declarant is asking for a declaratory judgment ruling on the United States Codes to be invalid and fraudulent, as there was no “enacting clause” provided for these United States Codes to be approved as all other valid laws prior to this, and after this, had enacting clauses attached to them.

93. There are two doctrines which apply. One, being the “clean hands doctrine,” and the other being the “Fruit of the poisonous tree” DOCTRINE. Both play a vital roll as this information about the United States Codes has been covered up or conveniently forgotten by the Respondents, and their agents, when the People of this Nation is, and are, forced into the court system when the United States Codes are used as a means to charge, convict and sentence without a corpus delicti and without proper procedural passage, approval or enactment.

## **XX. STATEMENT OF THE 2ND ISSUE**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 94, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

94. Whereas, Congress being the Constitutional legislative body that holds power to create, enact and pass laws into Public Law which are placed in the Statutes at Large, then any law placed in these Statutes is the intent which the laws are to be followed by

the United States. Did Congress follow these procedures and does the United States follow these laws as written and intended ?

### **XXI. STATEMENT OF THE 3RD ISSUE**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 96, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

95. Whereas Congress did create, pass and enact the following Public Law under the 39th Congress, Sess. 1, Ch 31 (1866), CHAP. XXXL, “An Act to protect all Person in the United States in their Civil Rights, and furnish the Means of their Vindication, April 9, 1866,” and at a later date did pass and enact in the Statutes At Large under these Public Laws 104-317, Oct 19, 1996, 110 Stat 3853; 93 stat 1284; and Public Law 96-170, 96th Congress, Dec 29th 1979. Does the United States follow these laws as written and intended ?

96. Congress did give the means to the People of the united States, and this Declarant, to bring an action to sue under color of law such law suits in civil or criminal action against those who violate or deprive any secured or protect right or liberty or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall have the same right, in every State and Territory in the United States, to make their rights and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, and give evidence, to inherit, and obligations purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property, and to full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of person and property, as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, and penalties, and to none other, any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, to the contrary notwithstanding. (paraphrased from the Act of 1866. NOTE: Sec 3 of that Act

which has other information on the district court of the United States having jurisdiction.

See page 27 of that Act.)

#### **XXII. STATEMENT OF THE 4TH ISSUE**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 99, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

97. Whereas Congress has created these Public Laws within the 10 mile square area of the United States jurisdiction, which is within the District of Columbia, are these Public Laws to be exercised exclusively over such District and its Seat of Governmental such as Agencies and Departments within that District **and/or** within or over the States that have erected forts, magazines, arsenals, docks-yards and other needful buildings only ? Or, perhaps, better put, do these Public Laws apply ONLY to that which the Government exclusively controls ?

98. Whereas Article 1 in the Federal Constitution concerns legislative power, and section 8, clause 17 of the Federal in the Constitution defines jurisdiction of such power to be exercised, what authority, outside of this clause, do these Public Laws have over the People of the united States of America and this Declarant ?

99. Whereas Congress has created these Public Laws within this District are the People of the united States of America, and this Declarant, restricted from using these Public Laws in their defense or in a charging instrument in a court of law ?

#### **XXIII. STATEMENT OF THE 5TH ISSUE**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 102, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

100. Whereas the Federal Constitution, Article III, section I has established such inferior courts below the “one supreme Court” and this district court of the United States was a creation of Congress and enacted into public law, would this Court (the district court of the United States) now come under Article III, section 2, clause 1 as an Article III Constitutional court ?

101. Whereas Congress has established (created) from time to time other inferior Federal Courts in Congressional enactments of these Public Laws giving each court its own jurisdiction, are not the jurisdictions of the **United States district court**, the **United States District Court** and the **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT** different than that of the district court of the United States as these are **four distinct and different courts** as defined in public law ?

102. Whereas this filing is a declaratory judgment challenge of whether the UNITED STATES CODES were properly enacted under Public Law then the only inferior court created by Congress under the Revised Statutes of 1873 is this “district court of the United States,” and not the “United States District Court,” the “United States district court,” or the “UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT” as found in the UNITED STATES CODES, a viable venue in which to address this Declarant's challenge ?

#### **XXIV. THE RESPONDENTS SIGNIFICANCE TO THE CASE**

All allegations and facts set forth in this filing, including paragraphs 1 through 106, are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

103. The People of the United States and this Declarant are the victims as the United States Codes are under the long arm jurisdiction doctrine.

104. Eric Holder, being the Attorney General of the United States within the 10 mile square, is the Attorney General for the United States and is the proper party to bring before the district court of the United States as one of the Respondents. 105 . Hillary Rodham Clinton being appointed to the Department of State as Secretary of State for the UNITED STATES now has to be notified under the "long arm jurisdiction doctrine" as the other Respondent as the District of Columbia is considered as both a Federal District and a Federal Territory both of which are foreign to the rest of the States (the united States of America). See CAHA v. U.S. , 152 U.S. 211 (1894)

"The laws of congress in respect to those matters do not extend into the territorial limits of the states, but have force only in the District of Columbia, and other places that are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the national government."

Ruhrstrat v. People, 57 N.E. 41 (1900)

"There is a difference between privileges and immunities belonging to the citizens of the United States as such, and those belonging to the Citizens of each state as such".

United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875)

"We have in our political system a government of the United States and a government of each of the several States. Each one of these governments is distinct from the others, and each has citizens of it's own..."

---

Gardina v. Board of Registrars of Jefferson County, 160 Ala. 155; 48 So. 788 (1909)

"There are, then, under our republican form of government, two classes of citizens, one of the United States and one of the state".

Colgate v. Harvey, 296 U.S. 404; 56 S.Ct. 252 (1935)



"The governments of the United States and of each state of the several states are distinct from one another. The rights of a citizen under one may be quite different from those which he has under the other".

Blair v Ridgely, 97 D. 218, 249, S.P. People v. Coleman, 60 D. 581

"Prior to the adoption of the federal Constitution, states possessed unlimited and unrestricted sovereignty and retained the same even afterward...except as such was surrendered to the federal government or they were expressly prohibited from exercising by the United States Constitution."

106. The People of the united States of America and this Declarant, Delant- Cory; family of palmerton, will remind the Court and the Respondents, even though these case law cites are prior to 1938, the UNITED STATES and the District of Columbia still holds that 14th Amendment, clauses 2, 3, and 4 citizenship status both then and now, and that 16 stat 419 and the Act of 1871 are still in effect and alive and well.

### **CONCLUSION**

This Declarant will point to the Public Statutes at Large Volume I to the foundation of the inferior courts; "Establishment of the Judicial Courts of the United States. An act to establish the judicial courts of the United States. Sept. 24, 1789." This Public Law enacted by Congress was the foundation and creation of the Federal Courts, the U.S. Marshal Service and the Office of Attorney General under Congressional Mandate. The same Congressional legislation that has created the Federal Courts, the U.S. Marshal Service and the Office of Attorney General has also, by legislative enactment, empowered the People with the ability to "Act" as a Private Attorney General to sue and bring suit in civil or criminal action to be heard before the district courts.

The People of the United States and this Declarant, Delant- Cory; family of palmerton, being the real parties of interest as the UNITED STATES CODES are being used both Federally

and in the States as law against the People and for the State to receive Federal funds, the Declarant and the People pray for a Declaratory Judgment in the National interest.

Whereas Eric Holder being the Attorney General of the UNITED STATES within the 10 mile square area of the District of Columbia, and whereas Hillary Rodham Clinton being the head of the Department of State within the same jurisdiction, and whereas the Department of State depends on a set of codes that are in question and that may have a negative effect on this Nation, then the questions and issues posed must be addressed and settled, in a timely and procedurally mandated manner, by this district court of the United States.

### **DECLARATORY RELIEF**

**First Declaratory Relief;** is to address the Constitutionality of the United States Codes as there is no legislative enactment on Dec 7th 1925 in the Statutes at Large of those Codes in the same manner as this “district court,” the U.S. Marshal Service and the Office of Attorney General which were created under "Establishment of the Judicial Courts of the United States. An act to establish the judicial courts of the United States Sept. 24, 1789."

**Second Declaratory Relief;** is to confirm if the Statutes at Large are the Congressional enactment of the rule of law, the intent of the law and the method under which all laws are created ?

**Third Declaratory Relief;** is to definitively confirm that the following Law is valid and was passed and enacted under the 39th Congress, Sess. 1, Ch 31 (1866), CHAP. XXXL, “An Act to protect all Person in the United States in their Civil Rights, and furnish the Means of their Vindication, April 9, 1866,” and if Congress, at a later date,

did pass and enact in the Statutes At Large under these Public Laws: P.L. 104-317, Oct 19, 1996, 110 Stat 3853; 93 stat 1284; and Public Law 96-170, 96th Congress, Dec 29, 1979.

Private Attorney General Seal



*Delant-Cory; family of palmerton*

Delant-Cory; family of palmerton 12-14-2012  
Private Attorney General  
2420 Demaray Dr  
Grants Pass, OR. [97527]

Bounty Hunter Seal



**PROOF OF SERVICE**

NOW COMES the People of the united States of America and Delant- Cory;  
family of palmerton filing into the Clerk of Court, district court United States, a Writ for a  
Declaratory Challenge; Request For Declaratory Judgment Per Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 57,  
improper use of laws; Just Cause For "*In Forma Pauperis*," to be placed before this  
district court of the

United States on this 14<sup>TH</sup> day in the month of December in the year of our  
Lord 2012 AD. Served via FedEx.

*Delant- Cory; family of palmerton*  
Delant- Cory; family of palmerton 12-14-2012  
Private Attorney General  
2420 Demaray Dr  
Grants Pass, OR [97527]

Cc

Eric Holder, an individual U.S.  
Department of Justice 950  
Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Hillary Rodham Clinton, an individual  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street NW  
Washington, DC 20520